



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,894	10/08/2004	Kenneth Lee Perdue	PU020113	2481

24498 7590 12/13/2006

THOMSON LICENSING INC.
PATENT OPERATIONS
PO BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

FLORES, LEON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,894

Applicant(s)

PERDUE, KENNETH LEE

Examiner

Leon Flores

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 October 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/8/2004
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The Figures 1-2 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(o). Drawings submitted to the Office must be suitable descriptive legends may be used subject to approval by the Office, or may be required by the examiner where necessary for understanding of the drawings. They should contain as few words as possible.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to because **“the labeling of each element in Figs. 1 & 2 are not very clear”**.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New

Art Unit: 2600

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 16-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claims 16-20, the limitation "the circuit arrangement of claim " should be rewritten as "the method of claim ". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-4 & 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as being anticipated by De Vos et al. (US Patent 6,367,079 B1)

Re Claim 1, De Vos et al disclose a circuit arrangement (See Fig. 2A or 4A) comprising: a first circuit having an output line and an input line (See Fig. 2A or 4A:

Art Unit: 2600

element 29); a second circuit having an input line for receiving signals from the output line of the first circuit, an output line for transmitting signals to the input line of the first circuit ((See Fig. 2A or 4A: element 21); and a control circuit for controlling signals transmitted from the second circuit output line to the first circuit input line. (See Fig. 2A or 4A: element 22)

Re Claim 2, De Vos et al disclose the circuit arrangement of claim 1 wherein the control circuit controls signals transmitted from the second circuit output line to the first circuit input line in accordance with signals transmitted at the output line of the first circuit. (See col. 4, lines 44-62.)

Re Claim 3, De Vos et al disclose the circuit arrangement of claim 2 wherein the control circuit inhibits the signals transmitted from the second circuit output line to the first circuit input line when the first circuit is transmitting signals at the output line of the first circuit. (See col. 4, lines 51-62. During write-in operations, element 21 is not allowed to transmit any data.)

Re Claim 4, De Vos et al disclose the circuit arrangement of claim 2, wherein the control circuit keeps the input line of the first circuit at a high state when the first circuit is transmitting signals at the output line. (It is inherent that the input line in element 29 must be kept high (or 1) in order to prevent receiving data from element 21.)

Re Claim 14, De Vos et al disclose the circuit arrangement of claim 1 wherein the control circuit controls signals transmitted from the second circuit output line to the first circuit input line according to a mode of operation. (See col. 4, lines 44-62. During write-in or write-out mode operations, element 22 control the data flow between elements 21 and 29.)

Claim 15 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 1. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims (5-8, 10, 12-13) and (16-18) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Vos et al. (US Patent 6,367,079 B1) as applied to claims 1-2 and 15 above respectively, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (para 0004-0005, hereinafter, "prior art").

Re Claim 5, De Vos et al. fails to teach that wherein the first circuit is a selected one of Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter (UART) and Universal Synchronous/Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter (USART). However, the applicant's prior art does. (See paragraphs 0004-0005)

Taking the combined teachings of De Vos et al & the applicant's prior art as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modify the system of De Vos et al to include this feature for the benefit of receiving and transmitting serial data using different serial bit rates.

Re claim 6, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention").

Re claim 7, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention").

Re claim 10, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention").

Re claim 11, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention"). Furthermore, one skill in the art would know that G-link circuits can be connected to control external pager module. Furthermore, this circuit arrangement has been used in the ATC311 high definition televisions, as disclosed by the applicant (paragraph 0017).

Re claim 12, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention").

Re claim 13, applicant's prior art teaches the claimed limitations (See paragraphs 0004-0005: "Background of Invention").

Claim 16 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 5. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 5 above.

Claim 17 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 6. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 6 above.

Claim 18 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 7. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 7 above.

Claims 8-9 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Vos et al. (US Patent 6,367,079 B1) in view of applicant's admitted prior art, as applied to claims 7 and 18 above respectively, and further in view of Olsen et al. (US Patent 6,639,513 B2)

Re Claim 8, the combination of De Vos et al & applicant's prior art fails to specifically disclose that wherein short-circuiting the bidirectional line initiates a demonstration mode. However, Olsen et al does (See col. 5, lines 36-67, col. 6, lines 1-43.)

Olsen et al disclose an enabler for enabling a device to perform at one desired function. The enabler comprises of a pull-up resistor in series with a combination inductor and a capacitor. Furthermore, a fusible link 56 is coupled to a device or any functional feature. When the fusible link is shorted, any functional device connected to it will be placed in an inoperable mode or a demonstration mode.

Taking the combined teachings of De Vos et al, the applicant's prior art, and Olsen et al as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated this feature for the benefit of rendering devices inoperable or in demonstration mode.

Art Unit: 2600

Re Claim 9, the combination of De Vos et al, applicant's prior, and Olsen et al disclose the circuit arrangement of claim 8 wherein the shorting circuiting is a short circuit to ground. (In Olsen et al., see Figure 3. Also, one skill in the art would know that one way to short circuit an element is to short circuit it to ground.)

Claim 19 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 8. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 8 above.

Claim 20 is a method claim comprising steps that would have necessitated the corresponding elements in the system in claim 9. Therefore, this claim has been analyzed and rejected in view of claim 9 above.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Flores whose telephone number is 571-270-1201. The examiner can normally be reached on Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu Le can be reached on 571-270-1195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LF

November 20, 2006



VU LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER